

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION
To be cited only in accordance with FED. R. APP. P. 32.1

United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Submitted September 20, 2024*
Decided September 20, 2024

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

ILANA DIAMOND ROVNER, *Circuit Judge*

JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-1314

HELENE TONIQUE LAURENT
MILLER,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Northern District of
Illinois, Eastern Division.

v.

No. 20 C 7437

CAROL M. HOWARD, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

Virginia M. Kendall,
Chief Judge.

ORDER

Helene Miller, who has a history of filing frivolous and repetitive federal lawsuits, appeals a district court's judgment dismissing her civil rights case for lack of prosecution. We affirm.

* We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the briefs and record adequately present the facts and legal arguments, and oral argument would not significantly aid the court. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

In 2020, Miller first brought this action in Illinois state court, alleging constitutional violations in connection with her indictment in an ongoing state criminal case against her. After the defendants (an Illinois state judge, the State of Illinois, and the City of Chicago) removed the case to federal court, District Judge Dow stayed the case until the underlying criminal proceeding was resolved. In 2022, Judge Dow ordered a joint status report on the state-court case. Miller never responded to the order.

In 2024, the defendants moved to dismiss the case for lack of prosecution. Miller also did not respond to this motion, which Judge Kendall (who had since been reassigned the case) in turn granted.

On appeal, Miller does not engage with the district court's reasons for dismissing her case, *see* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8), and instead asserts that both district judges were biased against her—as reflected, for instance, in their rulings to deny several motions of hers. But adverse judicial rulings alone will almost never suffice to establish judicial bias. *Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994); *see United States v. Barr*, 960 F.3d 906, 920 (7th Cir. 2020). And to the extent Miller sees bias in the lack of a response to her motion to recuse Judge Kendall, we see nothing in this record—which includes a flurry of other motions filed by Miller—that raises any reasonable concern about the judge's impartiality. *See Liteky*, 510 U.S. at 555.

One final matter. Miller filed this appeal before we sanctioned her this past spring with a *Mack* filing bar. *Miller v. Exec. Comm. of the U.S. Dist. Ct. for the N. Dist. of Ill.*, No. 23-2281, 2024 WL 1651669, at *2 (7th Cir. Apr. 17, 2024). Because of this recent sanction, we decline to impose additional sanctions now, but we remind Miller that the filing bar remains in full force for all appeals filed after its imposition.

AFFIRMED